महोदय, आप ने मुझे समय दिया, इस के लिए आप का आभारी हूं। मैं कल्याण मंत्री जी से दरख्वास्त करता हूं कि जिन बातों की ओर मैंने इंगित किया है, चाहे वह शैड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स का मामला हो, शैड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स का मामला हो, मायनोरिटीज का मामला, वूमेंस का मामला हो या हेंडीकेप्ड का मामला हो, हैंडीकैप्ड की हालत तो और भी खराब है, जिन के कल्याण के लिए यह मंत्रालय बना है, उन के लिए वह सही तौर पर काम करे। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): We have concluded the Discussion on the working of the Ministry of Welfare. The Minister will give a reply on Wednesday.

Now, we will take up the Private Members' Resolution moved by Shri N. Giri Pradsad. Last time, on 14th March, Shri Surinder Kumar Singla was speaking and he had not concluded has speech. He is not present here, and there is no other name. So, the Minister is going to reply.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTION

Growing Sickness of Public Sector Undertakings

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI MURASOLI MARAN): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I congratulate the hon. Member, Thiru N. Giri Prasad, for having brought this Resolution in this House because this Resolution highlights the public sector undertakings which dominate our thinking, and it also gives an opportunity to the Government to come out with its policies. Sir, Thiru Giri Prasad himself is a great revolutionary. He braved bullets; that is why, he was every emotional, in the sense that he, with nostalgia, referred to the Soviet Revolution and great leaders like Lenin. Sir, we are all emotionally inclined towards the public sector. I am also one of those who are inclined towards it. That is why whenever something happens to our public sector undertakings, we are all emotionally upset. So, I share the feelings of the hon. Members. I think, here, every Member knows very well how deeply I am involved in reviving the public sector undertakings. Sir, if India has an industrial base today, it is largely because of the public sector undertakings because public sector has been central to our philosophy of development. Even in 1994, when the Bombay Plan was sponsored by the eight prominent industrialists, they assigned to the State and its planning mechanism the primary responsibility for industrialisation. Sir, public sector achieved the commanding heights of economy, but what happened was, we came down from the commanding heights and entered into the field of consumer goods and the services sector, in the sense that the public sector started making bread, making shoes and selling several other things, which is not at all necessary. Sir, another tragic thing was, we had acquired many of the bankrupt, sick private sector units which were about to close or which were closed. That is the problem because almost one-third of the losses of the public sector undertakings are due to those sick undertakings which we have acquired. Sir, in the past, as many as 47 units were taken over by the Government from the private sector after they became sick. That was done in public interest and also for safeguarding the interests of the employees. So, in the last four decades we have invested massively in the public sector. Upto last year, the total investment in the public sector was Rs. 1,78,268 crores. Sir, that is a huge amount. What we have to improve the functioning of the public sector undertakings. A lot of exhortation has been made to improve the functioning of public sector undertakings. It has become a standard part of the Indian menu of economic reforms. We have been mouthing sweet words about reforms, but I am sorry to say that nothing concrete has been done. Efforts have been made by the Government, and several Committee have been appointed. They are the Krishna Menon Committee, the L.K. Jha Committee, then the Arjun Sengupta Committee of 1984. Mr. Chaturvedi is not here; he reminded me about the Arjun Sengupta Committee.

The Sen Gupta Committee recommended closing down of chronically sick units. But we could not do that. Sir, when we speak about public sector undertakings, we don't want to make wholesale attack on the public sector undertakings. I don't say that all the public sector undertakings are bad. For example, according to the latest review of 1995-96, 134 enterprises have made a profit of Rs. 14,704 crores. It is a great improvement. In 94-95, the number of profit-making enterprises was 130 and they made a profit of Rs. 12,124 crores. In 94-95 the number of loss-making enterprises was 109 and this year it has come down to 101. Those 109 enterprises made a loss of Rs. 4,883 crores in 94-95 and 101 enterprises made a loss of Rs. 4,826 crores in 95-96. There is a marginal reduction. Four enterprises are making neither loss nor profit. This is the situation. At the same time, there is the problem & sickness. But I cannot say that sickness is there only in public sector undertakings. The private sector is no exception. In almost all the private sector undertakings the role of financial institutions in their financial structure is very great. For example, take the case of ITC. I think our public financial institutions have got more shares than the British-America Tobacco, BAT.

There is a humorous saying — in India we have only publicly managed public sector and privately managed public sector. This is the saying of a famous member of the Planning Commission. So, they are also sick. But we have to make a difference. When the private sector goes sick, we don't feel the pinch immediately. But at the same time, it is not *laissez-faire* that we are advocating. I cannot say, everything private is virtue and everything public is non-virtue. I won't say that. As the economists say, there is an area of economic activity in which the market is unchallenged. But, at the same time, there is a range of activities where services and functions of the State are either necessary or socially superior. So privatisation alone is not enough; it is not any better than state. So the dominant rule one can apply is, as one economist said, the decision must be made on social and economic merits of a particular case. Sir, this is an age of practical judgment. The public sector is essential. Even in America, public sector played a very important role. For example, the modren Jet Aircraft is a product of military research and development. America has made a spectacular gain in productivity in agriculture. But it was due to participation of State and publicity sponsored land grant college system and extension services. So are many medical discoveries also. They are all due to the public sector. Inevitably, in due course of time, the Government has come to a situation where it cannot spend more. That is the difficulty. The Government of India started accumulating additional public debt in order to meet revenue requirements of public enterprises. There was no problem until late 1970s when the Government was showing revenue surplus. But today the debt has ballooned and the revenue deficit has reached unprecedented proportions.

Therefore, we have to think twice before putting our money. The inefficient, loss making public sector undertakings are a significant burden on the Government's finances, Government's Budget, the banking system and our scarce resources. They have a negative effect on growth, crowding out expenditure on social sectors like health and education and indirectly limiting the efforts to reduce poverty. The larger the overall deficit, the larger the fiscal and current account deficit which in turn has a negative effect on growth. So, it is very costly and our poor country cannot afford it. Therefore, the inefficient, loss making public sector undertakings are looked upon as a significant burden on the Government's finances, the Government's Budget, the banking system and our scarce resources. They hinder growth. They have a negative effect on growth. Their impact on fiscal stability and inflation is increasing and so we have to make good the situa-

tion somehow or the other. How do we improve the situation? Our Common Minimum Programme has clearly stated our attitude towards the public sector undertakings and I quote, "The public sector will continue to be an important component of Indian industry. The United Front will help to make the public sector strong and competitive. In a competitive and technologically driven economy, there is no room for monopoly and inefficiency. Public sector enterprises which are essentially commercial enterprises should conduct business on commercial lines. They cannot be allowed to dis-save. They should show a healthy return on the capital employed." This is the crux of the problem. We have to make our public sector undertakings profitable. Generally, inefficient production in any enterprise is because of the state of technology, economies of scale and professional management. The public sector undertakings are handicapped on all these accounts. We do not have the latest technology. We do have have the economies of scale. We do not have professional management. We suffer on all these accounts. Therefore, what we require is financial, managerial, organisational, technological and operational oriented restructuring. In certain areas, product profile may be out of tune with the market requirements. We have to restructure them. Technology might have become obsolete. We have to improve them. So, these are the things which we have to undertake. At the same time, I would like to tell you that we are for the revival of public sector undertakings There are certain things which cannot be revived. I want to have a discussion with hon. Members on this. I can only give an assurance that if there are public sector undertakings which can be revived, this Government will not hesitate to revive them. There are certain facts which may not be palatable to some of us here. A study reveals that very few members of the public are aware of the fact that nearly 100 public sector enterprises which have been consistently making losses do not serve any public purpose by any stretch of imagination and we spend over Rs. 66,000 in addition to salary to keep alive one job in this industry. This was a study made by a research scholar. I wish he was wrong. But because of this, we cannot close it down. We should try to make it profitable. How do we make it competitive? How do we make it a commercially profitable undertaking? In this context, I would like to tell the hon. Members of this House what we have done during this short period of time. Sir, we have revived, in these eleven months six undertakings. For example, in the case of revival of the Heavy Engineering Corporation, Ranchi the revival package involves a fresh infusion of funds to the tune of Rs. 252 crores. we writing off Rs. 272 crores of Government loan and the conversion of loan into equity and debentures of Rs. 99 crores. So, the total cost to the exchequer is Rs. 623 crores. Sir, scooters India Limited, Lucknow has been revival with a package of fresh infusion of funds is Rs. 22.45 crores. We have written off Rs. 593.59 crores. Conversion of loan into equity and debentures is Rs. 27.22 crores. So the total cost to the exchequer is Rs. 643.26 crores. Then for the revival of Hindustan Photo Films Limited, Rs. 20 crores has been given as working capital to re-start the operation. Another Rs. 5.50 corres has also been released as salary for the first three months of 1997. It has started functioning, it has been revived. Then for the revival of Mandya National Paper Mills we have provided Rs. 8 crores for re-starting the operation of the company. The Government will also release another Rs. 3 crores for VRS very shortly. So we intend to revive it at the cost of Rs. 11 crores. Then, Sir, in order to revive the operations of Damodar Slag and Cement Limited, the Government has handed over the management to the cement manufacturers, the major cement manufacturers, the ACC, with the consent of the labourers and with the help of the State Government I want to thank the State Government and the hon. Chief Minister for that, Sir, it may be interesting to all of us to hear that after the takeover by ACC, the capacity utilisation of

the plant has increased for about 28 per cent to about 80 per cent. How is it possible? Sir, It clearly shows that the management was not good. The same laburers are there. What we have done is, we have changed the top. When it is occupied by efficient, professional people, now it is working to the capacity of 80 per cent. Where is 28 per cent and where is 80 per cent. So definitely bad management, mismanagement is one of the reason. Then, Mr. Dipankar Mukherjee, will be very happy to know that we have approved revival package of revived Tyre Corporation of India also. Fresh infusion of funds is Rs. 42.5 crores, write-off by Government is Rs. 67.31 crores, conversion of loan into equity is Rs. 165.79 crores. The total cost to the exchequer is Rs. 275.64 crores. But in the case of Tangra Unit the new Braided Hose Project may be taken up only after the realisation of the sale of land and after proper technoligical tie-up is made. Then the project has also to be appraised fully after such technological tie-up. So in all these six cases the cost to the exchequer is Rs. 1,578.81 crores. Sir, this has been done during the last eleven months. So I can proudly say that in such a short period no Government has revived so many units. Do you like to know the previous record? In the last five years they have revived only five units at a cost of Rs. 495 crores whereas in the short period of eleven months we have taken up revival of six units on hand at a cost of Rs. 1,600 crores. Sir, this is the record. I will go further and say, Sir, in this Expenditure Budget for 1997-98; volume one, there is a statement of the amount given to the public sector undertakings, the Plan investment in public sector enterprises. Sir, the total amount of Plan outlay for one year is Rs. 63,309.52 crores. In this, equity will be Rs. 4,829.94 crores. Loans will be Rs. 2771.21 crores and internal resources will be Rs. 31,153.79 crores. Bonds and debentures will be Rs. 11,818.94 crores. ECB, External Commercial Borrowings will come to Rs. 5517.21 crores and others Rs. 7218.43 crores. So in toto this year alone the Government is going to spend Rs. 63,309.52 crores. Now the moot question is, should not the Government get some adequate return for this huge amount because they are borrowing, I am told, at the rate of 13 per cent? So it is the tax-payers' money. It is coming because tax-payers are willingly paying taxes. They must earn a return. So if Rs. 63,000 crores are productively invested, there will be a healthy return. If public sector undertakings show a healthy return surely the Government will provide more money for investment in the public sector.

3.00 P.M.

Now I want to say what we have done regarding public sector autonomy. We have delegated increased powers to the board of directors of those PSUs which are making profits. In the case of companies with less than Rs. 100 crores, we have increased the limit of power to incur from Rs. 5 crores to Rs. 10 crores. Between Rs. 100 crores and Rs. 200 crores, earlier they were permitted to incur capital expenditure only Rs. 10 crores. Now we have allowed them to go up to Rs. 20 crores. Between Rs. 200 crores and Rs. 500 crores, earlier they were having power of Rs. 20 crores. Now were have allowed them to spend up to Rs. 40 Crores. Above Rs. 500 crores, we have permitted them to incur the capital expenditure up to Rs. 100 crores. This is the situation. Now we have identified nine PSUs as Navratnas which have got comparative advantages and which can be promoted to become global giants. I am taking meetings. We have decided to give maximum autonomy in the sense that whatever they want they can do because they have to complete not only with the private sector but also with the contemporary global giants. These are the policies of the Government. so, I want to tell the Mover of this Resolution, my dear friend, Mr. Giri Prasad, that the Government will not hesitate to revive any revivable public sector under-taking. I assure you—this is a solemn assurance—that we are pro-labour. We will do it

and we will have mututal discussions. We are meeting quite often. I am willing to meet anybody. I am meeting Mr. Dipankar Mukherjee very often. Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta is in touch with me almost everyday. Therefore, let us prepare a list. We cannot have a generic plan for all PSUs because every enterprise requires an enterprise-specific restructuring plan. Once again I assure the hon. Member that we will revive any public sector undertaking which has the potential and possibility of being revived. Mr. Dipankar Mukherjee has said as to how the BIFR was standing in the way of revival. I totally agree with him. It takes time. It is a time-consuming process. The hon.. Finance Minister has stated in his Budget Speech that we have to revamp the SICA Act. The Bill is in the offing. The Cabinet has already given its approval. I think either in this Session or in the next Session, it will be introduced. With these words, I request the Mover of this Resolution, my dear friend Mr. Giri Prasad, not to press his Resolution.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Now, Mr. Giri Prasad has to reply.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, sir, I may be permitted to say a few things because the hon. Minister has taken my name. He quoted me as having said something regarding BIFR.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): He was referring to your name. It is good.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, I want to clarify the position.

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Sir, any debate on public sector will include his name.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, I have to make only one point, for clarification sake, I don't blame the BIFR so far us PSUs are concerned. In most of the cases even though the BIFR makes its recommendations, their implementation will get delayed because of the indecision on the part of the Government. I know he is handling only one Ministry. There are many PSUs which come under various other Ministries. My suggestion to the Government was—to him personally that at the time of BIFR's hearings, the Government, as the promoter, should be represented by all the concerned Ministries. Presently, only one Ministry represents the Government before the BIFR. The Finance Ministry is not represented. Even if some decision is taken at the BIFR's hearing, its implementation gets delayed because it has to be approved by the whole Cabinet. My point is, why cannot the Government send representatives from both the Finance Ministry and the concerned Ministry so that without any waste of time, we can revive a sick unit? This was my suggestion.

SHRI BANGARU LAXMAN (Gujarat): Sir, the Ministry has said that everything will be done to see that the public sector is made competitive. The officers of the Government are represented on the Board of Directors of the PSU's. But some of them are not attending the Board meetings. For instance, I know one public sector unit where the Government's representatives has not attended the Board meetings for the last two years.

I will cite the state of that public sector undertaking. It has ordered worth Rs. 27 crores, inventory worth Rs. 24 crores but its turn-over is only worth Rs. 4 crores. There is no stoppage of work. There is absolute understanding between the workers and the officers. But who has to tackle this? Who has to ask? These things are very clear from the Annual Reports of individual public sector units but nobody is following up, nobody is monitoring.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Shri Giri Prasad. But before you start, if you allow me I will request Shri Nilotpal Basu to take the Chair.

(THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NILOTPAL BASU) IN THE CHAIR)

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD: Mr. Vice-Chairman, this is the first opportunity that I have got during this tenure in the Rajya Sabha to move a private Member's Resolution and I am happy that this Resolution has attracted the attention and involvement of many Members in highlighting their view-points. Another aspect of my happiness is the way the hon. Minister of Industry has involved himself in this whole debate ending with his clear-cut assurances in this regard.

But, on the whole, a big debate is going on in our country. This debate is mostly on ideological grounds for which the earlier Government to a large extent and to more extent this Government are partially or fully responsible. The public sector is eating away the money of the public and the private sector is creating the wealth and that is the only way for our future. These are the ideological lines on which they have embarked upon themselves. And now this is the idelogical backing, unless it is joined by other forces. If that is so, I am not for wasting public money on any ground. I do not want any worthwhile unit to suffer in going ahead or any bad unit to suffer losses. My intention is that our country must produce wealth. At the same time, there should be some justice also. What is the guarantee that the private sector alone can produce the wealth? Has it produced wealth? Has it created adequate employment? Has it given benefits to its own workers and also to the society? Once or twice I raised one or two points here, expecially during the Budget Session, as to how much money these private sector giants are eating away and siphoning off by circumventing various laws including the taxation policy. It may be excise, it may be customs or it may be the Income Tax or it may be on any other account. But these public sector units can't misbehave like that. They will have to pay. Where it is the Government money and it is a Government company, it is paying. But they are siphoning off the money and eating it away. Who gives the account for that? Of course, after eating away the Government money, they can show profits. But my point is that the public sector can also exhibit its strength by wrong methods. The private sector can also exhibit its strength by the same methods. But there is no level playing field in this regard. One has got the benefit of malfeasance and the other has no such opportunity. That is why when we compare the two sectors, the public sector and the private sector, we should not take sides on ideological grounds. After all, from the days of Pt. Nehru, our country has accepted the policy of mixed economy. We thought of giving to the public sector the position of commanding heights. We may give it in the future, we may not give it. I am not concerned with that jsut now. Whatever we have done in the past, now our main worry is how far this United Front Government after coming to power has assumed the responsibility of protecting the public sector, wherever it can be. The CMP has provided all avenues to the Government. I believe, it has been worked out very well. As far as the Government parties are concerned or even the other opposition parties are concerned, there is no big difference on this issue. But, in this House sometimes we hear that we have to give up the public sector and we should go in for the private sector. The private sector has also not worked well. In the last general elections in the U.K. where Mrs. Margaret Thacher had ruled the roost for many years, her party was in power for 17 years, she had to go only because of their partiality to laissez faire and also their unresponsiveness to many social causes. These factors were responsible for the downfall of the Tories. Though the Labour Party has changed a lot in its policies, in its outlook, in its economic policies, it is committed to protect the public sector to some extent. In fact, when I saw their programme, I found no big difference between the policy of the Communist Party and of the Labour party because

under rule 4 or something they are committed to nationalising all that is possible to be nationalised. But, now they have amended it but not fully given up. Still there are some via-medias which they have found. My only point is even the best capitalist countries or the most prominent capitalist countries could not go whole hogs in favour of privatisation and denigration of the public sector. The so-called privatisation that was undertaken in the western countries has not yet been completed and they will not be able to complete it. We are new people and we don't know where to start and how to start. By denigrating the public sector day in and day out, by taking up the cause of the private sector and by not allowing the public sector to function on proper lines, I think, we are harming our national interest.

When I raised this issue, I made one point clear. After all, we have invested — our hon. Minister has also said — Rs. 1,78,000 crores in these public sector companies. It is the hard earned people's money. We must get returns for that and we must invest these returns in future developmental activities also. But, there is no effort on the part of the Government. I have been saying — many times I have said that many industries which required Rs. 200, Rs. 300 crores earlier though our hon. Minister was saying that his Government has already invested Rs. 1,000 crores or so in the last eleven months as against Rs. 400 or Rs. 500 invested in the five year rule of the previous Government—of course, these figures look comparatively impressive. I have no doubt about it. But, still there are areas, if there are no ideological blinkers. I think, the Government can find various methods to involve workers to improve the efficiency and functioning of these public sector companies and make them profit-making companies. Though there are 101 loss-making companies, accounting for a loss of almost Rs. 5,000 crores, some may be incorrigible, I don't know. But whatever it is, the government should undertake a major study on unit-wise basis to know which are the units which can be revived and should then take steps to revive them. But, I don't think the government is starting from that angle. The Government is starting from the angle of providing for budgetary resources. Where is the money? Of course, they are prepared to lose money by continuing these loss-making units, but they are not providing money to make them profit making units... or to reduce the losses or to make them worthwhile as a real producer of wealth. So, I think the Government must undertake a serious study in these matters. In the past four or five years, the BIFR is acting, as pointed by an hon. Member, as a ...*(Interruptions)*... I do not know what they are doing. Actually, when that Bill was brought in this House, I also spoke on that. I do not know what results the BIFR has produced so far in arresting the sickness in industries both in public and private sectors. I am asking it, and it will not be clear in future also because there is nothing that can be done by them. To pronounce a patient dead, you need not take the body to hospital when he is dead. So, the public sector companies and the private sector companies are being taken to the BIFR and to a judgment after three or four years, when there is nothing left. I know many industries of big companies even killed by the non-intervention of the BIFR. The people say that they have no power. That is also true to some extent.

The hon. Finance Minister in his Budget Speech said that these *navratanas* would be improved and they would be encouraged. I think that is a good policy. At least, we can have the credit of encouraging certain companies to be global giants even though it may not be an easy job. Some companies, especially the BHEL, are doing a wonderful job. The BHEL is not a monopoly or anything like that. Even in power sector projects undertaken by the NTPC or the State Electricity Boards have no monopoly. They are bidding and they are getting.

They are even going to the international market. Even without any monopoly concept or monopoly concession, they are doing a wonderful job. It all depends on the professionalism of public sector. There is no drive undertaken to professionalise them. When I go to any factory, many workers say, "This gentleman is a nice manager or chairman. He can do some job to improve the situation." If somebody else is appointed, the same workers say, "This man will ruin the company." These are the persons from whom the government can know about the management. The workers and the trade union leaders know better as to who is better and who is worse and who is to be placed in what position. They will tell you about all these things. But, the government will not take anybody into confidence except their own bureaucrats. Bureaucrats may sometimes give a better advice or sometimes may give a wrong advice. That depends on their whims and fancies. That is why in order to improve the efficiency of public sector, to reduce the losses in the loss making units and expect better revenue from these sources, you have to take the working class into confidence. Consulting Dasgupta or Dipankar Mukherjee may not be a big job. On a wider plan, I think, you have to consult the working class as a whole. If you want some intelligence also as to which manager is doing what and how to improve the situation, I think you will get a better feedback in this respect. That is why you take the workers and their organisations into confidence so that you will have better opportunities to assess the things and especially in professionalising the management.

Secondly, of course, you have invested some money, 50% or more of which is for writing off the old debts that you have already incurred. But, that is not enough because in such cases you should not grudge investing money because that money will not go waste. If there is a commitment by the government and also the political parties to improve the situation, naturally, this money will give you returns. Even supposing you sell away a unit for some price, then those people should also make money. How can they make money on the low-priced value that they will make the money; on that basis also you can expect; even if you sell it away, you will get only Rs. 10 crores, whereas you invested about Rs. 100 crores. So, you will get returns only for Rs. 10 crores. On that basis, if you work out and try to improve the situation, then I think you will get better results; whether to lead to any disinvestment or not that all depends on the policies of the Government.

Disinvestment for disinvestment sake should not be undertaken. If there is any use either financially or economically, then that can be tried. I do not want to prolong further because this is a subject on which everybody spoke and everybody is enlightened. We have to protect the public sector, make it more productive, competitive and efficient in all these things. Wherever it is absolutely necessary, if one unit is dead and if it cannot be revived, that I can understand; but that is also provided in the CMP. The hon. Finance Minister was also saying that everything that is revivable would be revived. All these things are good things. But, anything can be revived only if you take some measures both, administrative and financial. If you invest money, if you employ a good officer or a manager you can have some results. You can take workers also into confidence. Unless you do all these things, I think, the situation will not improve. I am happy if there is improvement to some extent. I am happy that the Cabinet is discussing about one or two things.

Lastly, I will respond to the hon. Minister's appeal not to press the resolution. I am not pressing this resolution, I need not press also, because whatever I wanted to highlight, I have highlighted sufficiently. The hon. Minister has also responded well. There is a public document called CMP to which the whole Government, to some extent the Opposition and the whole House is committed. If we make sincere and serious efforts to

implement that policy and take every possible step to improve the efficiency and competitiveness of the public sector, the situation may improve. When there is such commitment in the words of the hon. Minister, I think, I can take his assurance as a basis for not pressing this resolution.

Sir, the last point is, the hon. Finance Minister said in his Budget speech that the hon. Minister for Industry would make a statement and that statement, I think, would be on the public sector. There is some political problem in the recent period. So, I cannot press him to make that statement in this session itself. But, at least, during the next monsoon session of Parliament, the Government must come forward with a White Paper or a black paper or a statement, as promised by the hon. Finance Minister so that there would be a good opportunity for the House to discuss, at length, and also take up concretely what project or which industries or which companies can be revived, how they can be revived and some positive suggestions may also come up. I request the hon. Minister, at least, to think about making a statement in whatever form he thinks fit. That is left to him. That is for him to decide. But there should be a proper opportunity to discuss on the initiated policy on the public sector in the coming session of Parliament, if it is not possible now. Thank you, Sir.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI MURASOLI MARAN): Sir, the hon. Member has referred to a White Paper. We did not promise any White Paper. What we are doing is, we are preparing a paper for giving maximum autonomy to the *Navaratnas*. That is one aspect. Another aspect is, we went to give managerial and financial autonomy to other profit making enterprises. I think, we need not wait till the next session; within a fornight or so, the Government will come out with a press-note ... *(Interruptions)*... I think the hon. Member for his cooperation ...*(Interruptions)*... It is a question of automony i.e., total autonomy to the Navaratnas and managerial and financial autonomy to other public sector undertakings.

SHRI N. GIRI PRASAD: No, Sir. Let there be no confusion on this issue. The hon. Finance Minister stated in his Budget speech that the hon. Minister for industry would make a statement, maybe, on the same lines, but that should be done in the House. Even if the Government announces during the inter-session period, there should be some opportunity for the Parliament to discuss it ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MURASOLI MARAN: Let us not wait till the next session which is going to take place sometime in the month of July ...*(Interruptions)*... What I am saying is, we prepare it and I think, the Cabinet will approve it and we will release it to the Press very soon and anytime, any day, the House may discuss, if it wants.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NILOTPAL BASU): But, I think what he mentions is that there should be a scope to discuss that paper in the House. Anyway, since he is not pressing for the Resolution, I ask for the sense of the House. Has he the leave of the House to withdraw the Resolution?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Sir.

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI NILOTPAL BASU): We move on the next Private Member's Resolution. Shri Jalaludin Ansari.

Acute Scarcity of Drinking water in villages

श्री जलालुदीन अंसारी (बिहार): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सदन में निम्नलिखित संकल्प उपस्थित करता हूं कि:

> यह सभा इस तथ्य पर कि स्वतंत्रता प्राप्ति के 50वें वर्ष में भी देश के हजारों गांवों में पेयजल की अत्यंत कमी है, अपनी गहरी चिंता व्यक्त